```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
United States of America,
              Plaintiff,
                             ) CR15-00707-PHX-SRB (MHB)
                             ) Phoenix, Arizona
        vs.
                              ) December 29, 2015
Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem,
                             ) 9:31 a.m.
              Defendant.
        BEFORE: THE HONORABLE SUSAN R. BOLTON, JUDGE
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
    EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INTERIM PRETRIAL CONFERENCE-DAY 3
             (Pages 319 through 372, Inclusive)
APPEARANCES:
For the Government:
            U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
            By: Kristen Brook, Esq.
                 Joseph Edward Koehler, Esq.
            40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1200
            Phoenix, AZ 85004
For the Defendant Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem:
            MAYNARD CRONIN BRICKSON CURRAN & REITER PLC
            By: Daniel D. Maynard, Esq.
                Mary Kathleen Plomin, Esq.
            3200 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800
            Phoenix, AZ 85012
Official Court Reporter:
Elizabeth A. Lemke, RDR, CRR, CPE
Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312
401 West Washington Street, SPC 34
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2150
(602) 322-7247
Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter
Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription
```

1			
2		INDEX OF WITNESSES	
3	SPECIAL AGENT JOH	N M. CHIAPPONE:	
4	Direct examination by Mr. Koehler Cross examination by Mr. Maynard Redirect examination by Mr. Koehler		Page 322
5			Page 329 Page 343
6			
7			
8		INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
9	EVITOTE NO	DECOLUMN	DECETTED
10	EXHIBIT NO.:	DESCRIPTION:	RECEIVED:
11	Exhibit No. 17		Page 325
12		Communication dated 8/23/12	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
 2
          (Called to the order of court at 9:31 a.m.)
 3
               THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
 4
      Please sit down.
 5
               THE CLERK: Criminal case 15-707. United States of
 6
      evidentiary hearing.
 7
               MR. KOEHLER: Good morning. Joe Koehler and Kristen
      Brook for the United States.
 8
 9
               MR. MAYNARD: Good morning, Your Honor. Daniel
      Maynard on behalf of Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem who is in
10
11
      custody and present in the courtroom.
12
               THE COURT: We may have a few items to discuss today,
13
      but since we have our witness here and ready to proceed, I
14
      thought we'd take his testimony here, whether you wanted to
15
      make any argument, closing argument on the motion, and then we
16
      could discuss whatever other items we need to talk about
17
      concerning this case.
               So we'll begin by swearing in the witness, Maureen.
18
          (Witness duly sworn.)
19
               THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record and
20
      spell your last name.
21
2.2
               THE WITNESS: Special Agent John M. Chiappone.
23
      C-H-I-A-P-P-O-N-E.
24
               THE COURT: Before you begin, Mr. Koehler,
25
     Mr. Maynard, can you and your client see the witness?
```

```
1
               MR. MAYNARD: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
 2
               THE COURT: Can you and your client see the screen?
               MR. MAYNARD: Yes.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  Thank you.
 5
               You may proceed, Mr. Koehler.
               MR. KOEHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
 7
          (Witness Chiappone appearing via video conference.)
             SPECIAL AGENT JOHN M. CHIAPPONE, WITNESS, SWORN
 8
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
 9
10
          Agent Chiappone, could you please introduce yourself to
      the Court, tell us where you work, and how long you've worked
11
12
      there.
          Yes. My name is Special Agent John Chiappone. I'm an FBI
13
14
      Special Agent assigned to the New York Drug Terrorist and Task
15
              I have worked in the New York Joint Terrorist Task
16
      Force for approximately 15 months. Previous to that I was
17
      assigned to the Phoenix Joint Terrorism Task Force.
18
          How long were you with the Phoenix JTTF?
          Just under four years. I have been with the FBI for about
19
      five-and-a-half years.
20
          What was your experience before joining the FBI?
21
22
          Prior to the FBI, I was a Captain in the United States
23
     Army, Military Police Corps, as well as a Deputy Sheriff for
24
      Bristol County, Massachusetts Sheriff's Office.
25
          Very good. Were you stationed in Phoenix, Arizona, in
      Q
```

```
2012?
 1
 2
          Yes, I was.
 3
          And were you co-case agent on a case involving an
      investigation of a person by the name of Abubakar.
 5
      A-B-U-B-A-K-A-R. Last name Ahmed. A-H-M-E-D?
 6
          Yes, I was.
 7
          And can you give us a brief overview of what the
 8
      investigation involved in the June to July to August time
      frame of 2012?
 9
10
          Yes. We were investigating Mr. Ahmed due to his ties to
      possible terrorist activities, as well as his use of a
11
12
      possible forged document to enhance or further those terrorist
13
      activities and also a violation of Title 18, 1001.
14
          What was the forged document?
15
          The forged document was an Arizona State University
16
      diploma that Mr. Ahmed had attempted to get produced for him
17
      and forged.
          And what was the statute that was involved in that
18
      particular offense?
19
          That was Arizona Revised Statute 13-2002, Section 82.
20
          Were you involved in the execution of the search warrant
21
22
      in relation to the attempted obtaining of the forged ASU
23
      diploma?
24
          Yes, I was.
25
          Prior to the execution of the search warrant, had you and
      Q
```

1 another person interviewed Abubakar Ahmed? 2 Yes. Myself and Task Force Officer Daniel Herrmann had 3 interviewed Mr. Ahmed. Where did that interview take place? 5 The interview took place at Arizona State University 6 Police Department on 7/11/2012. 7 Based on that interview and the other evidence that you had gathered up until that point, did you make a determination 8 on whether to open a full investigation into Mr. Ahmed's 9 10 activities? 11 Mr. Ahmed was previously a preliminary investigation 12 being overseen by a separate agent. And based on that 13 interview and other information we had, we opened the -- we 14 decided to open a full investigation on Mr. Ahmed. 15 I'm going to direct your attention to Exhibit No. 17. Do you have that with you there today; is that 16 17 correct? I have it Exhibit 17. 18 Yes. Looking at the last page of that, does that last page of 19 that exhibit tell you what date that you formally reopened the 20 investigation? 21 2.2 The first page shows the date that the report was 23 serialized and the last page date shows the date that I began 24 to draft the report. 25 And what was the date you began to draft the report? Q

```
1
     Α
          That was on 7/19/2012.
 2
          And does this report fairly and accurately depict your
      reasons for reopening the investigation at that point in time?
 3
 4
          Yes, it does.
 5
               MR. KOEHLER: Move to admit Exhibit 17.
               MR. MAYNARD: No objection.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: 17 is admitted.
          (Exhibit 17 admitted in evidence.)
 8
     BY MR. KOEHLER:
 9
10
         As part of your investigation, was there a particular area
      of focus that you were looking at in terms of the forged
11
12
      document?
          Yes. We believed it was possible that Mr. Ahmed was going
13
14
      to utilize the forged document in furtherance of terrorist
15
      activities. Part of that was in order to prove one of the
      requirements of Arizona Revised Statute 13-2002, which is the
16
17
      intent to defraud.
          And so were you looking for evidence of that intent to
18
     defraud?
19
          Yes. We believed the intent to defraud could be directly
20
      related to Mr. Ahmed wanting to further his terrorist
21
22
     activities.
23
          During the execution of the search warrant, were computer
24
      devices recovered?
25
          Yes, there was.
     Α
```

1 Q Was one of those computer devices a Lenovo laptop? 2 Α Yes, it was. Did you have occasion to speak to an individual then known 3 to you as Decarus Thomas regarding that laptop? 5 I interviewed Decarus Thomas on 7/20/2012 at the 6 residence. 7 And specifically, did you ask him about who else besides him used that computer? 8 I specifically asked that question and Decarus 9 10 Thomas had told me that Mr. Ahmed had utilized this computer; 11 that Mr. Thomas had to yell at Mr. Ahmed to get off his 12 computer on numerous occasions because he was using it. 13 After that, did agents seize that particular computer? 14 That was the deciding factor in seizing that 15 computer. We had previous discussions on whether to seize 16 that specific computer or not based upon the interview and 17 Mr. Thomas telling us that Mr. Ahmed had used that computer. We felt we needed to seize that in furtherance of our 18 investigation. 19 To your knowledge, did your CART Team perform an 20 extraction of the content of the computer? 21 22 Α Yes, they did. 23 And do you use the CART software to examine computers on 24 occasion? 25 I have used it on occasion, but to be frank, I'm bad at Α

```
1
      using the software. That's why we usually get experts that we
 2
      have in the FBI to assist on that.
 3
          When using CART software as a user, does it require you to
      give it search parameters in order to conduct a search of the
 5
      computer?
 6
                That is a requirement in order for that to happen.
 7
          And what kinds of things do you have to provide in order
      to use the software?
 8
          Keywords and search terms of information that you would be
 9
10
      interested in finding on the computer devices.
          Did you solicit assistance from anybody in searching the
11
12
      electronic devices in this case in the 2012 search warrant?
13
          Yes. My co-case Task Force Officer Dan Herrmann as well
14
      as Intelligence Analyst Amy Vaughan because her computer
15
      expertise is far superior than mine.
16
          (Court reporter requested witness to repeat his answer.)
17
               MR. KOEHLER: Can you repeat your answer please?
               THE WITNESS: Absolutely. I asked for assistance
18
      from Task Force Officer Daniel Herrmann and Intelligence
19
20
      Analyst Amy Vaughan. Ms. Vaughan, specifically, because of
      her computer knowledge being far superior to mine.
21
22
     BY MR. KOEHLER:
23
          And did you give Ms. Vaughan search parameters to use in
24
      conducting the search?
25
          I did.
                  We had discussions about what to search for.
      Α
```

```
1
          Okay. And what did you tell her to search for?
 2
          Briefly, the terms that we -- I gave Amy -- or Ms. Vaughan
 3
      to search for were terms related directly to the forgery of
      the ASU document, as well as terms related to terrorism due to
 5
      my belief that the intent to defraud was directly related to
 6
      furtherance of terrorist activities.
 7
          After Ms. Vaughan went through the computer, did she
      produce a report to you?
 8
          Yes, she did. She produced -- she prepared a report on
 9
10
      all of the devices, the numerous devices that were found.
11
          Did her analysis of the electronic devices appear to
12
      connect activity involving travel to the Middle East and so
13
      forth to the document?
14
          Very much so. There were a couple different documents
15
      found in the computer. One was an application for the Islamic
16
      University in Saudia Arabia and another one was titled
17
     Authentication of Documents.
               And both of those had a requirement to have at least
18
      a bachelor's degree in order to apply to that Islamic
19
      University.
20
          And did Mr. Ahmed have a bachelor's degree, a real one, to
21
22
     your knowledge?
23
          No, he did not. And we had done extensive searches of the
24
      Arizona State University database and records to ensure that
25
     Mr. Ahmed did not, in fact, have that degree that he had
```

```
1
      produced and attempted to produce through the publishing
 2
      company.
 3
               MR. KOEHLER: Can I have a moment, Your Honor?
               THE COURT: You may.
 5
               MR. KOEHLER: I have nothing further at this time,
 6
      Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Maynard.
                            CROSS EXAMINATION
 8
     BY MR. MAYNARD:
 9
10
          Good morning, Agent Chiappone.
          Good morning, sir. How are you?
11
     Α
12
          Fine, thanks.
13
               Now, prior to this search warrant being issued in
14
      2012 for Mr. Ahmed's residence, how long had you been on the
      Terrorist Task Force in Phoenix, Arizona?
15
16
          I arrived on the Terrorist Task Force, I believe it was
17
      May 1st, 2011, so a little over a year, about 15 months, give
     or take, at that point.
18
          As part of your work, were you aware that Mr. Simpson had
19
     been prosecuted for lying to the FBI in 2010?
20
          Yes, I was aware of it, but I obviously did not have a
21
22
     problem in that case.
23
          You have indicated to us that you participated in an
24
      interview with Mr. Ahmed on July 11th of 2012. Had you ever
25
      interviewed him prior to that?
```

```
1
          Yes, I had. I interviewed Mr. Ahmed at his residence, the
 2
      same residence where the search warrant was conducted sometime
 3
      in 2011. I don't remember the exact date offhand, but --
          If I were to suggest to you that it was on November 30th
 5
      of 2011, would that refresh your recollection?
 6
                November 30th sounds correct.
 7
          Okay. And were you interviewing Mr. Ahmed at that time
 8
      because you thought that he might be involved in some sort of
      terrorist activities?
 9
10
          Mr. Ahmed was under a preliminary investigation at that
11
      time by another agent. However, my primary reason for
12
      interviewing Mr. Ahmed was due to investigation I had on
13
      another subject who he was also affiliated with at that time.
14
         And who was that?
          At this point I don't know if that subject is still under
15
16
      investigation, if that's been disclose. Before I answer that,
17
      I don't know if I can or not. Is there someone I could advise
      that?
18
               THE COURT: Was it Mr. Thomas?
19
               THE WITNESS: Mr. Thomas was under investigation but
20
      he's not the one I'm referring to at this time, ma'am.
21
22
               THE COURT: Okay. At the moment I'm going to allow
23
      him not to answer the question because it doesn't appear
24
      necessarily relevant and could possibly jeopardize another
25
      investigation.
```

1 MR. MAYNARD: Okay. 2 BY MR. MAYNARD: Who participated in the interview of Mr. Ahmed with you? 3 On November 30th it was myself and Special Agent Kevin 5 O'Brien. 6 Was there a 302 prepared for that interview? 7 Α Yes. I believe there was. Do you know where that 302 is? 8 It should be in Mr. Ahmed's case file. 9 10 Okay. So is there a case file on Mr. Ahmed that you have Q seen that would contain that 302? 11 12 Α Yes. 13 Okay. Do you recall how long that interview lasted? 14 Not precisely. I would say it was approximately an hour 15 or less. 16 And it was at his home? Okay. 17 It was in his residence. He invited us in to speak to him. 18 And did you see his computer in his home at that time? 19 Yes, I did. 20 Α And did he identify that computer as being his computer? 21 22 Yeah. He identified a laptop that was laying there that was his. 23 24 And did you find that same laptop when you executed the 25 search warrant in 2012?

1 I believe so. However, at that time on November 30th, 2 2011, I didn't go and look at the computer and take a serial number from that computer, so I cannot say that for certain. 3 Okay. Did you interview anyone else at Mr. Ahmed's 5 residence on 2011 other than Mr. Ahmed? 6 Mr. Thomas was interviewed. He was not interviewed by me 7 personally, but he was interviewed by other agents. Was he called by Mr. Ahmed and asked to come to meet with 8 the FBI? 9 10 I believe so. I don't think Mr. Thomas was there at that 11 point, though I can't say that for certain. 12 But you did not participate in that interview; is that correct? 13 14 No. I was not the interviewing agent on Mr. Thomas at 15 that point. Were you interviewing Mr. Ahmed while Mr. Thomas was being 16 17 interviewed? I'm trying to figure out how this is going on. Yes. Myself and Kevin were in the kitchen with Mr. Ahmed 18 and Mr. Thomas was being interviewed either in a separate room 19 or outside the apartment. 20 And who interviewed him, Mr. Thomas? 21 22 I believe -- I would have to check the case log, but I 23 believe it was Special Agent Michael Vanostein(ph) and might 24 have been Special Agent Craig Schellenger(ph) but I would have 25 to check the file to be certain if Mr. Schellenger was there.

1 And do you have an understanding that a 302 was prepared 2 of that November 30th, 2011 interview? And I should clarify, a 302 or a possible EC would 3 Α 4 have been written at that point. 5 When I say "possible EC," possible Electronic 6 Communication, because if interviews are classified, they 7 could be put in an EC and not a 302. Can you recall whether or not those interviews were audio 8 taped? 9 10 No, those interviews were not audio taped to my knowledge. Was there a file that the FBI had on Mr. Thomas in 2011 at 11 12 the time that you did the interview? 13 Yes, there was. Α 14 And as far as you know, that 302 or that EC should be in that file; is that correct? 15 16 That would be my understanding, yes, that's correct. 17 Now, the government has shown you what was marked as Exhibit No. 11. Do you have that in front of you -- I'm 18 sorry. Exhibit 17. 19 Yes. Exhibit 17 is right here. 20 21 Is this a report that you prepared? 22 Α Yes, this is. 23 And according to this report, was Mr. Ahmed -- had he been

That's when his preliminary investigation

the target of an investigation since July 25th of 2011?

24

25

Α

That's correct.

1 was initiated. 2 So from July 25th of 2011 until at least the time of the execution of the search warrant, Mr. Ahmed was under 3 investigation by the FBI concerning possible terrorist 5 activity; is that correct? 6 That's correct. That's correct. 7 Okay. Did you know an ASU police officer by the name of Herrmann? 8 Yes, I did. 9 10 And did you office with him as part of the Joint Terrorist Task Force? 11 12 Yes, I did. 13 Is he the one who advised you that ASU had been notified 14 of the possibility that Mr. Ahmed was seeking to forge a 15 diploma from ASU? 16 Yes, he was. 17 Did you participate with Mr. -- Detective Herrmann in preparing a search warrant for Mr. Ahmed's residence? 18 Yes, I did. 19 Α And what role did you play in preparing that search 20 warrant? 21 22 I read over Detective Herrmann's search warrant affidavit. And then myself and other people in our squad, as is quite 23 24 common when writing a search warrant, would give him advice on 25 how to, you know, any mistakes he might have found or

```
1
      something such as that, kind of proofreading.
          Did you attempt to provide in the search warrant to cover
 2
      all computers and electronic devices that would be in
 3
 4
      Mr. Ahmed's residence?
 5
                In the search warrant we were looking to search for
 6
      anything that Mr. Ahmed would have access to that would
 7
      allow -- that would have evidence of the crime that he was
      being investigated for.
 8
          Weren't you also investigating him for possible terrorist
 9
10
      activity at the time?
11
      Α
          Yes, we were.
12
          Did you go with Detective Herrmann when he met with the
13
      Superior Court judge from Arizona to get the search warrant?
14
          No, I did not.
      Α
15
          Did you participate in -- strike that.
16
               Did you specifically talk to Detective Herrmann about
17
      not putting information in the search warrant concerning
      terrorist activity?
18
          Not that I recall. Again, that search warrant was focused
19
      for forgery and his attempt to defraud, so that was what
20
      Detective Herrmann had focused his affidavit on.
21
22
          Well, what you were really looking at for almost a year
23
      prior to this was whether or not Mr. Ahmed was involved in
24
      terrorist activity, correct?
25
          For the year prior, yes, absolutely.
      Α
```

- 1 And that's why you had interviewed him in November of 2 2011, correct? 3 Part of the reason and his association with another individual. 5 And did you ask Mr. Ahmed to be an informant for the FBI? 6 I did not. Another agent might have spoke to him about 7 that at that time, but I personally did not ask him to be an informant for the FBI. 8 Did you overhear another agent ask him to be an informant? 9 10 Yes, I did. Α 11 Okay. Was that the primary purpose for the interview in 12 2011? 13 Absolutely not. Α 14 Did Mr. Ahmed refuse to be an informant for the FBI? Yes, he did. 15 Α Okay. Was Mr. Thomas asked to be an informant for the 16 17 FBI? That I don't know. I was not on that interview, so we 18 would have to look at the 302 or EC on that interview or talk 19 to those agents to determine that. 20 And I take it you have not reviewed that EC or that 302 in 21 22 preparation for your testimony today?
- 25 today?

Α

No, I have not.

23

24

What have you reviewed to prepare for your testimony

I reviewed the Exhibit 17. I reviewed the documents 1 2 regarding the search warrant and regarding the CART searches on the computer and I reviewed the 302s that I wrote on 3 4 Mr. Thomas, Mr. Ahmed, and Mr. Simpson's interviews the day of 5 the search warrant. 6 But you did not review any of the 302s for Mr. Ahmed from November of 2011; is that correct? 7 No, I did not. I did not, that's correct. 8 When the search warrant was executed, it was 9 Okav. 10 approximately 10:30 in the morning? 11 Α Approximately. 12 And there were over 20 officers that were involved in 13 this, correct? 14 Yes. Α 15 You were off-site at the time? You were not actually on 16 the site when the search warrant was being executed? 17 No. At the time of the Phoenix Police Department's serving of the search warrant, I was in the driveway, the 18 joint driveway by the garages of that residence. 19 And did -- who was it that actually picked up all of the 20 electronic devices to inventory them as part of the search 21 22 warrant? That would have been various agents of the FBI and Phoenix 23 24 Police Department that were on scene. 25 And then were those items then taken out and put into a Q

```
1
      van and inventoried?
 2
          Yes.
          Okay. And did you -- after that was done, did you come in
 3
      and interview the three individuals who were living there?
 5
          We interviewed them on the outside. The Phoenix Police
 6
      Department pulled those individuals out and had passed them
 7
      off to us to continue to secure the residence and at that time
      we began to interview them.
 8
          And did you interview Mr. Ahmed first?
 9
10
          I believe so, but I don't remember the exact procession of
      who was interviewed first or who was interviewed second, but
11
12
      we did interview all of them and Mr. Simpson was actually
13
      interviewed twice within a short period of time and there is
14
      two separate 302s documenting that.
15
          Okay. And did the interviews last until approximately
16
      12:30?
17
               I mean, maybe in total, but none of the interviews
      were extremely long. I would say the November 30th interview
18
      was much longer in length than the interview on 7/20.
19
          Did -- just a moment, Your Honor, please.
20
               On Exhibit 17 on the first page on the details --
21
22
      Α
          Uh-huh.
23
          -- you have indicated that Phoenix is reopening and
24
      converting caption matter to a full investigation based on
25
      evidence that Abubakar Hussein Ahmed committed a violation of
```

```
1
      Title 18, Section 1001. What is 1001?
 2
          Section 1001 is lying to a federal officer.
 3
          Okay. And you then on the second page put:
 4
               "In addition to this violation, there is probable
 5
      cause to believe Ahmed has also committed violations of
 6
     ARS 13-2002. That was the forgery charge, correct?
 7
     Α
          That's correct.
         After the computers were seized and analyzed, how long did
 8
      that take to analyze the material that was on the computers?
 9
10
          I don't know. I would have to look at the reports and the
11
      dates of the reports. But it was a priority for our squad, so
12
      I imagine that we did it quite quickly.
13
          I mean, is that the kind of thing you could do in a couple
14
      of days or did it take weeks to do?
15
               It usually take weeks. I mean, the information needs
     Α
          No.
16
      to be uploaded into the system. The search parameters have to
17
      be inputted into the system. And then the agents involved
      have to go through it.
18
               Depending upon the amount of data that was on the
19
      computers, which I don't know how many gigabytes offhand was
20
      the computer, will determine how long that will take, but it's
21
22
      usually a matter of weeks.
23
          Were you the one who was basically leading this
24
      investigation?
25
          I was the primary case agent on this document.
     Α
```

```
1
          Did you give instructions to any of the FBI agents to
 2
      focus on the forgery aspect or information involving forgery
      that could be found in the computers?
 3
          I asked the agents and analysts that were looking through
 5
      it to look for both information involving forgery and
 6
      terrorism due to the direct link between the forged document
 7
      and the terrorist activity that we were investigating.
               So we had the ASU investigation into forgery.
 8
      was the FBI investigation into terrorism which was separate.
 9
10
      But the important thing was the search warrant was for the
11
      forgery, so we were looking to see, one, evidence of forgery;
12
      and two, the intent to defraud. And we were assisting in
13
      that.
14
          But you were also then looking to see if there was any
15
      potential terrorist activity?
          No. We were looking for the intent to defraud which was
16
17
      related to the terrorist activity. We believed that the
      purpose of getting that forged document was to further
18
      Mr. Ahmed's terrorist activity and that would be his attempt
19
      to defraud.
20
          Well, did you instruct the agents that after they had
21
22
      looked into certain sections, if they didn't see anything that
      had to do with forgery, that they should stop looking into
23
24
      certain areas of the computer information?
25
          I instructed the agents, as I stated, to look for evidence
     Α
```

```
1
      of forgery and evidence of terrorism that would prove the
 2
      intent to defraud in the use of that forged document to
      further terrorist activities.
 3
          Do you have an understanding that the agents downloaded
 5
      everything on the computers and looked at everything in all of
 6
      the computers?
 7
          My understanding is they looked through everything through
      the CART program that would be populated into based on the
 8
      search parameters.
 9
10
          Okay. And did you then take a look at the reports that
      were generated to differentiate between what was found on the
11
12
      different computers and electronic devices?
13
                The reports that were written, which I believe are
14
      other exhibits, listed out each device by device and what was
      found on each device.
15
               MR. MAYNARD: I don't have any further questions,
16
17
      Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
               Agent Chiappone, I have one question for you.
19
               With respect to the search that you did of the Lenovo
20
      laptop with the assistance of Ms. Vaughan --
21
2.2
               THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
23
               THE COURT: -- the documents that you spoke about
24
      that were found pursuant to the search parameters, was there
25
      any way for you or Ms. Vaughan to determine the identity of
```

1 the individual who made those searches? 2 THE WITNESS: Ma'am, I'm not really good with computers. I'm going to try to explain it the best I can. 3 4 Basically, in the CART program, it's going to show 5 you as much as you can see based upon the search. So I know 6 for some of the searches it will actually show you if someone 7 was, like, logged into their e-mail or something. 8 So, for instance, a YouTube search for videos would show you this person searched for the videos. And the same 9 10 thing, I believe, would go if they were logged into a Yahoo 11 account and searched Yahoo for, you know, FakePerformance.com 12 or something like that. 13 In this particular case I would have to look at the 14 report or perhaps Ms. Vaughan to know if that was linked 15 directly in the computer who was searching for it. But to my 16 general knowledge, that's how it works. If they were logged 17 into something, you could see who was searching it. THE COURT: Well, one of the specific things that you 18 mentioned was that there was searching related to an 19 application for the Islamic University. 20 And was that specific information, to your knowledge, 21 22 linked to any particular individual that had access to the 23 Lenovo computer? 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. That information was 25 linked to Mr. Ahmed. I would have to consult the report to

```
1
      detail out how it was linked to Mr. Ahmed, but I do recall
      that the search for Islamic University was directly linked to
 2
 3
      Mr. Ahmed.
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
 5
               Mr. Koehler, redirect?
 6
                           REDIRECT EXAMINATION
 7
      BY MR. KOEHLER:
          Agent Chiappone, do you have the full report of
 8
      Ms. Vaughan there with you?
 9
10
     Α
          I do.
11
          You mentioned that you would need to consult that. Would
12
      that refresh your memory on how the -- what was linked to
13
      Mr. Ahmed in terms of the search of the computer?
14
               THE COURT: The Lenovo computer -- the Lenovo
15
      computer, specifically.
16
      BY MR. KOEHLER:
17
          Specifically, if you can look at that, directing your
      attention to computer 4, which is on the second page running
18
      to the third page of that report --
19
20
               MR. MAYNARD: What exhibit are we looking at?
21
               MR. KOEHLER: We're on Exhibit No. 14.
2.2
               THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes. I see computer 4.
23
               And computer 4 references Abubakar Ahmed having
24
      destroyed some court documents in the download folders, which
25
      suggested that Ahmed either used this computer or it was used
```

```
1
      on his behalf. And that computer 4 had Internet history of
 2
      logging into abubakar5500@Yahoo.com.
 3
               And abubakar5500@yahoo.com, I know, from my
      investigation, is the e-mail address that was used to contact
 4
 5
      JFD Publishing asking for the forged document.
 6
      BY MR. KOEHLER:
 7
          Was any of the information about searching for entrance
      requirements for the University in Saudia Arabia contained --
 8
      did that appear to be contained in computer No. 4?
 9
10
               It did not. That information did not appear to be
          No.
11
      contained in computer No. 4.
12
          So that information would have come from another computer?
          That's correct.
13
14
          Let's talk for a minute about the relevance of terrorist
15
      information to the fraud investigation.
               You mentioned that you needed to show an intent to
16
17
      defraud; is that correct?
          That's correct.
18
      Α
          In your experience, have fraudulent documents been used in
19
      connection with terrorism-type offenses?
20
          Yes, they have. I have even come across it in my recent
21
22
      investigations.
23
          Can you, without getting into the specifics of a
24
      particular investigation, give some examples of the types of
25
      things that you have seen?
```

```
1
          Specifically, referring to a recent investigation, my
 2
      current case is on the Paris attacks, deployed to Paris,
      France, the day following the attacks.
 3
               And in that attack, forged passports were utilized by
 5
      two of the suicide bombers. So that's the most recent example
 6
      I can think of.
 7
          And have you seen other examples where people obtain
      forged documents and use them to obtain legitimate documents
 8
      in order to further offenses that are related to terrorism?
 9
10
                Forgery and fraud in general, whether it is to make
11
      money from a fraud perspective in furtherance of terrorist
12
      activities or a forged document to make money or give yourself
      access to something is commonly used.
13
14
          Now, the case that you reopened in 2012, you mentioned
15
      that that originally was opened in 2011; is that correct?
16
          That's correct.
      Α
          Has that case ever been fully closed?
17
18
          Not to my knowledge it's not.
          So is the case on Mr. --
19
20
          Sorry. Let me correct that.
               The case was closed following the preliminary
21
22
      investigation. There was an agent that was working that case.
23
      And in order to make it a smooth transition from the
24
      preliminary investigation, switch the case to myself and the
25
     new squad, it was actually closed and then immediately
```

```
1
      reopened around the July/August 2012 time period.
 2
      believe it has been active ever since then.
 3
          And that's the investigation of Mr. Ahmed; is that
      correct?
 5
          That's correct.
 6
          Can you explain why, specifically, you asked Decarus
 7
      Thomas on July 11 of 2012 about the Lenovo computer?
          On July 20th, the day of the search warrant?
 8
                Yes. July 20th of 2012. My apologies.
 9
10
                There was -- we had discussions amongst ourselves at
11
      the search warrant scene whether the computers of Mr. -- that
12
      were identified as Mr. Simpson's computer and Mr. Thomas's
13
      computer could be seized in good faith of a warrant.
14
               And so those interviews were conducted of Mr. Thomas
15
      and Mr. Simpson with the specific question asked, "Did
16
      Mr. Ahmed utilize your computer, " to determine that if we
17
      should seize those computers to find the evidence we were
      looking for or not.
18
               Both Mr. Thomas and Mr. Simpson, as documented in the
19
      interview 302s, said, yes, Mr. Ahmed had used their computers.
20
               Therefore, the determination was made to seize it.
21
22
               There are other items, for instance, there was about
23
      54 -- I believe the exact count was $5,490 that Mr. Ahmed had
24
      in a safe and $1200 that Mr. -- approximately $1200. We did
25
      not count it in his pocket -- that Mr. Simpson had.
```

```
1
               We believed there's a possibility that those were --
      that money was obtained from fraudulent activity. However, it
 2
      did not seem to be something that we could seize from our
 3
      warrant, so we did not seize that money. So we were taking a
 5
      very serious determination of what we could seize in
 6
      accordance with that warrant and what we could not.
 7
               MR. KOEHLER: I have no further questions.
 8
               THE COURT: Thank you.
               MR. MAYNARD: Your Honor, at the last hearing the
 9
10
      government produced Exhibit 14.
               And 14 was extensively redacted and I had asked the
11
12
      government to see if we could get one that was unredacted.
13
      Yesterday about 3:30 I got a copy of the unredacted version or
14
      less-redacted version. I would like to put that into evidence
      with this witness.
15
16
               It's the document that he was looking at and he was
17
      only looking at one page and it clarifies --
18
               THE COURT: So do you want to substitute the version
      that was given to you yesterday for Exhibit 14 that was marked
19
20
      for identification?
               MR. MAYNARD: Or I can put it in as a new exhibit.
21
22
               THE COURT: Well, I don't like to have duplicates,
23
      so, I mean, is there any reason why --
24
               Well, Mr. Koehler might have a reason and I will ask
25
     him after, but is there any reason why we can't simply
```

```
1
      substitute old 14 with new 14?
 2
               MR. MAYNARD: No.
 3
               MR. KOEHLER: I don't have an objection to that, Your
 4
      Honor, but I do not think that the witness has the unredacted
 5
      version of that in front of him. I think the witness --
 6
               THE COURT: Well, this isn't an invitation for
 7
     Mr. Maynard to engage in recross.
 8
               MR. KOEHLER: Okay.
               THE COURT: He had his opportunity to cross-examine
 9
10
      the witness. This is simply his wanting to substitute one
      unadmitted exhibit for another.
11
12
               You have no objection?
13
               MR. KOEHLER: I have no objection to doing that just
14
      so long as we are clear on what's in front of the agent who is
15
      on the stand right now.
               THE COURT: Okay. So we will -- if you provide us
16
17
      with the less-redacted copy of Exhibit 14, we will substitute
      that for the one that was marked at the beginning of this
18
      hearing last month.
19
               MR. MAYNARD: And if it hasn't been admitted, I would
20
      move for the admission of Exhibit 14.
21
2.2
               THE COURT: Apparently, it has been admitted.
23
               MR. MAYNARD: May I approach?
24
               THE COURT: Yes.
25
               I think that we can allow Agent Chiappone to -- I
```

```
1
      guess "hang up" isn't the right word for -- "disconnect" and
 2
      we will continue with any other matters we have to discuss.
 3
               Thank you very much, Agent Chiappone, for making
 4
      yourself available by video conference.
 5
               THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor, and a happy new
      year.
 6
               THE COURT:
 7
                           Thank you.
          (Video conference with Agent Chiappone ended.)
 8
               THE COURT: Mr. Koehler, did you wish to make a
 9
10
      closing argument on this motion to suppress?
               MR. KOEHLER: Your Honor, I believe I have stated the
11
12
      government's position rather thoroughly in the response to the
13
      defense motion.
14
               The only thing that I have to add and it's what I
15
      said in my opening statement, Your Honor, which is, in the
16
      response to the motion, I noted that the intent looked more
17
      like 404(b) type evidence. However, the intent is actually an
      element under section 2002.A.2 and it is one of the things
18
      that the agents were focused on when they were interviewing
19
      Mr. Ahmed on July 11th of 2012 and in conducting the search of
20
      the warrant.
21
22
               They were focused on what he was going to do with
23
      that diploma, because they had to prove that he had a
      fraudulent intent not merely to gain it, but to actually use
24
25
      it in some other manner.
```

2.2

And so the evidence of terrorist activity, as Agent Chiappone explained, that's a fairly common theme in terrorism offenses for someone to use fraudulent documents. And so that was something that they were specifically looking for. It was within the scope of the warrant.

As this Court very well knows, search warrant affidavits frequently don't make reference to other sensitive aspects of an investigation as long as those aspects otherwise fall within the scope of the warrant.

And in this case, terrorist-type activity did fall within the scope of the warrant because it was specifically the intent to use that document in that fashion.

And so in light of that, the search of the computers did fall within the scope of the warrant. And as we have already pointed out in our response, the agents came across that by an independent means, and that is, Sergio Martinez, having gotten that computer from Mr. Kareem. And because Mr. Martinez got that computer from Mr. Kareem and then voluntarily turned it over to the FBI, there is an independent source of the same evidence.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. MAYNARD: Your Honor, there may or may not --

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Maynard, I want you to start with Sergio Martinez' consent to search the Lenovo laptop

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

```
1
      which was undoubtedly in his possession and control and he had
      authority over -- he had the right to consent to its search
 2
      based on all --
 3
               The only evidence I have is that it was given to him.
 5
      He had it with everything that was on it. If the person who
 6
      gave it to him didn't delete the things that were on it,
 7
      either intentionally or thought he had and didn't, clearly,
      Mr. Martinez had everything that was on that computer when he
 8
      received it and could consent to its search.
 9
10
               So even if I were to think that the search warrant in
11
      2012 seized things that wasn't authorized to seize or that the
12
      search of the computer -- the Lenovo laptop then went beyond
13
      what should have been able to be searched even if it could
14
      have been seized, isn't it all a moot point if in 2014 or 2015
15
      Mr. Martinez shows up with the Lenovo laptop, gives it to the
      FBI, and says you have my consent to search everything that's
16
17
      on there.
               MR. MAYNARD: It certainly might be. We don't know
18
      what -- I can't tell you right now what was on the laptop that
19
      Mr. Martinez turned over to the government.
20
               If it's exactly the same, then you're right. If it's
21
22
      not exactly the same, if things had been deleted, the
23
      government cannot use the search that was done back in 2012.
24
      That was a pretext. So I don't know.
25
               THE COURT: So you're saying that we don't have
```

```
1
      evidence of what was actually on the Lenovo when it was turned
 2
      over to the FBI recently by Mr. Martinez?
 3
               MR. MAYNARD: That's right. I don't know what's on
 4
           I don't know.
                         My understanding is Mr. Martinez -- the
 5
      password was changed to the newest child. He used it to give
 6
      it to his son to play video games on.
 7
               THE COURT: But you would agree that whatever was on
 8
      there when Mr. Martinez turned it over, the FBI can use for
      any purpose?
 9
10
              MR. MAYNARD: Reluctantly, but, yes.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. Then continue with whatever
12
      argument you wish to make.
13
               MR. MAYNARD: Okay. Judge, this was clearly
14
      something that was brought by the Joint Terrorist Task Force.
15
      I understand that they had to do an investigation to determine
16
      whether or not somebody had forged a document or not and a
17
      diploma and maybe it was going to be used for something else.
               But when you go in and you ask a judge or you ask a
18
      magistrate to give us a search warrant to search somebody's
19
20
      house, to go through their private papers and their private
      documents, those judges and magistrates are supposed to be
21
22
      independent. They're the ones who are supposed to be the
23
      backstop to make sure that the police and the government are
24
      not going beyond what they're entitled to do.
25
               THE COURT:
                           I agree. But did they -- they drafted a
```

search warrant because of evidence that they had of forgery.

And the Court issued a search warrant to search for evidence of forgery, including all of the elements of forgery under Arizona State law which requires an intent to defraud.

The fact that the discovery of intent to defraud might also have disclosed evidence that would be helpful in the FBI's investigation of terrorism by Mr. Ahmed, does that require that if the search warrant was legitimate for its scope on forgery, that they have to say, oh, and by the way, Judge, not within your jurisdiction, but we've got another federal investigation into terrorism in addition to the Task Force's investigation of forgery.

I don't think they have to. You might think it would be nice if the judge who issued the search warrant knew everything that the agents knew but if the search warrant was legitimate for the scope of the search to determine the elements of fraud -- the evidence that would support the elements of forgery, isn't that enough?

MR. MAYNARD: No. And the problem is this, Judge.

In this day and age with computers, if this were a time 25 or 30 years ago when we just had paper documents and the Court had given them a warrant to go in and look for forgery, you would go through and you would look to see what you could find that would support allegations that somebody had forged something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: Well, but in this case, if we were in the
paper world, they would have seized the paper that was the
application for Islamic University or was information
concerning the requirements to be admitted to Islamic
University that would show that one of the things you had to
have was a college degree which Mr. Ahmed didn't have, and
therefore, needed a forged one to get into Islamic University.
         That clearly would have been seized in a paper search
to support the element of intent to defraud.
         And if the scope of the search was to try to find
documents, electronic documents like that, to show what he
wanted to use the forged diploma for, if they didn't search
with search terms that went way beyond evidence that Mr. Ahmed
used the computer and evidence that would support the element
of intent to defraud, isn't this the same as the paper search
where they would have looked through a lot of paper but not
been able to take the ones that weren't relevant and only take
the ones that related to what they were searching for which
was evidence to support the charge of forgery?
         MR. MAYNARD: Not necessarily, and here is why.
         When I go to the testimony of the ASU police officer.
         THE COURT: Herrmann.
         MR. MAYNARD: Detective Herrmann.
         I asked him questions.
         And did he advise you that they wanted to look --
```

```
1
      that the FBI wanted to look at things beyond evidence of
 2
      attempted forgery?
 3
               They offered this assistance to the search warrant.
 4
      To what ends I can't recall.
 5
               But what he does go on to say, I asked him the
 6
      question:
 7
               Was the FBI look beyond the forgery to see if there
      was any terrorist activity?
 8
 9
               And he says:
10
               Not to my knowledge.
11
               Well, that's not accurate.
12
               But where it actually becomes important is on page
13
      191 of his testimony on November 24th of 2015.
14
               And I said:
15
               This is a report that you prepared after you had
16
      completed your search of the computers, correct?
17
               Yes.
               This report doesn't indicate that you looked at any
18
      computers other than those owned by Mr. Ahmed, correct?
19
20
               He says:
21
               Yes.
2.2
               Was your focus on Mr. Ahmed's computer?
23
               Yes, it was.
24
               So to prepare the report pursuant to the warrant that
25
      had been issued, it was only necessary for you to look at
```

```
1
      Mr. Ahmed's computer?
 2
               His answer was:
 3
               Yes.
 4
               Judge, when I then look to Exhibit 17 which we just
 5
      replaced and I gave you the new copy --
 6
               THE COURT: Fourteen.
 7
               MR. MAYNARD: -- or 14, rather -- and this was the
 8
      one that I didn't have and I didn't get until four o'clock
      last night, so I couldn't have read this before.
 9
10
               It states in here the Computer 1, which is
11
      Mr. Ahmed's computer, that the first thing they're going to do
12
      is an analysis of this computer was conducted through the CART
13
      review system to determine if they contained any extremist
14
      material or other indications of criminal activity.
15
               And I'm looking at the second page of the document.
16
               And what they go on to say is on Computer 1 they log
17
          They find that there are Internet records found in
18
      Computer 1 that suggests that the user of the computer was
      attempting to obtain a fraudulent college diploma.
19
20
      messages archived and exchanged correspondence with eBay
      vendor selling diplomas. Additionally, the user searched the
21
22
      Internet for colleges that had closed and visited the
23
      websites.
24
               And all throughout the analysis of Computer 1, they
25
      find that the user of Computer 1 was applying for federal
```

```
1
      student aid. And it talks about looking at different
 2
      universities in the Middle East that he may be attending or
 3
      wanting to attend in Qatar, Somalia, Jordan, Pakistan.
 4
               They then go into Computer 3, which was the computer
 5
      that Simpson had.
 6
               Now, the person who is in charge of the
 7
      investigation, ASU Detective Herrmann, has just told us that
 8
      all he needed to look at was Computer 1. That was done
      already. That's all he ever used.
 9
10
               But what then goes on is that Computer 3, which is
11
      Simpson's computer, there's over two pages here of
12
      extremist -- or information that would indicate that one was a
13
      terrorist or that one was involved with terrorist activity or
14
      looking at terrorist activity.
               When we got to Computer 4, which was my client's
15
16
      computer, there is basically nothing there. I mean, this was
17
      YouTube -- he's got an e-mail address --
               THE COURT: Well, what's in the report essentially is
18
      that there was evidence that Ahmed had used it. That's all.
19
               MR. MAYNARD: Well, but to say that somebody has used
20
      it doesn't give you carte blanche authority to go through and
21
22
      look at everything that is in there.
23
               The detective in charge of the investigation said
24
      once I looked as the first computer, that's all I needed.
25
      That's all he ever used. He didn't need anything else.
```

This was a pretext, Judge. This whole warrant -- I mean, I understand that they went in there looking for activity to deal with a fraudulent diploma. But these individuals were also being targeted for possible terrorist activity, although it appears that they were asking two of the individuals -- or at least one of them -- that's Mr. Ahmed to be an informant for the FBI which he refused to do.

Judge, once you get a warrant, the case law as we spelled out in the brief, indicates that it just isn't -- you can't open it up to a general search. You really do have to be specific. And once you go into something -- and particularly, in the electronic age that we have now. I mean, this is becoming more and more important.

The government cannot just say I need to look for this potential criminal activity, crack the door open, and then go into and look at everything that is in there.

I'm not going to go through the cases I cited, but the case that dealt with the Barry Bonds case in San Francisco gives a very good analysis of why the FBI or any government authority that is looking into somebody's computer information, should not just go in there and look carte blanche.

And that's what the FBI was doing in this case. I mean, they weren't looking just to determine whether or not there was a forgery, which I think they should have been. I

```
1
      mean, if somebody is trying to forge with a computer and if he
 2
      was trying to use it for terrorist activity, they should have
      been looking at it.
 3
               But that doesn't give them the right to just go in
 5
      carte blanche and look at everybody's computer in there and
 6
      that's what they really wanted to do in this case.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Maynard.
               My first question for you, Mr. Koehler, is do we have
 8
      evidence of what was on the computer from when Mr. Martinez
 9
10
      gave it to the FBI and consented to search?
11
               MR. KOEHLER: Your Honor, a separate image was
12
      extracted from the Lenovo after Mr. Martinez turned it over to
13
                The government turned a blue ray of that image over
      the FBI.
      to Mr. Maynard. I can't remember the exact --
14
15
               THE COURT:
                           I quess maybe I could ask the question
      this way --
16
17
               MR. KOEHLER: Yes.
               THE COURT: Is there any evidence the government
18
      intends to offer in this case that isn't -- from the Lenovo
19
      that isn't on the blue ray made when Mr. Martinez allowed it
20
      to be imaged in 2014 or '15?
21
22
               MR. KOEHLER: We intend to use the 2015 image of the
23
              That will -- assuming we prevail at trial, that would
24
      avoid an appellate issue for us and so that's our intent is to
25
      go that route or would narrow the scope of the appellate
```

```
1
      issues, I should say.
 2
               THE COURT: So is this motion to suppress a moot
      issue because you don't intend to use any evidence from the
 3
 4
      2012 search?
 5
               MR. KOEHLER: Other than the Lenovo, that's correct.
 6
               THE COURT: Of the Lenovo?
 7
               MR. KOEHLER: There is the thumb drive that was in
      the Lenovo that we do intend to use that we assert in our
 8
      motion papers that he lacks standing to object to that search.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Because of the evidence that I have seen
11
      that the defendant disavowed ownership of the thumb drive?
12
               MR. KOEHLER: Correct.
13
               THE COURT: So what you're telling me today is that
14
      with respect to whatever was looked at in 2012, you don't
      intend to offer that search, but the new search from -- I
15
16
      don't remember what year.
17
               MR. KOEHLER: 2015.
               THE COURT: From 2015?
18
               MR. KOEHLER: That is correct, Your Honor.
19
               I do think it's important and we went to lengths to
20
      establish that the agents, in fact, operated within the scope
21
2.2
      of the warrant in 2012. And it was not --
23
               THE COURT: Well, I agree to a point.
24
               Based on the evidence that I have heard, they had the
25
      right to seize the Lenovo. And the search -- at least as
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidenced in Exhibit 14, reflects that what -- what the defendant Mr. Kareem said then turned out to be true, that Mr. Ahmed used his computer and we know that that's true based on the search. The question though is once they seized the computer that belonged to somebody else that Mr. Ahmed used for -- I don't know if it was occasionally, regularly, or all the time -- are they limited in their search of the computer to evidence that would support the elements of forgery? though, as a practical matter, they obtained an image are they prohibited from looking at anything that isn't within the scope of the warrant? Similarly too, if we were in a paper world and they went into a file cabinet and they might have paged through the files but they weren't -- they wouldn't be allowed to seize files that weren't supportive of what they were searching for. MR. KOEHLER: Your Honor, the one thing I would add to that analysis is that the agents in 2015 got a new search

MR. KOEHLER: Your Honor, the one thing I would add to that analysis is that the agents in 2015 got a new search warrant to search the image that they still possessed from the 2012 execution of the warrant.

THE COURT: I forgot about that.

MR. KOEHLER: And so we followed the necessary steps to go back and look through that.

THE COURT: So you agree that they had to limit their search in 2012. But since they still had the image and got a

```
1
      new warrant in 2015, they could search the whole thing is your
 2
      position.
 3
               MR. KOEHLER: That's correct. One of the things that
 4
      Mr. Maynard raised in his papers was the notion that the
 5
      agents held onto that image too long.
 6
               Well, as has been pointed out, the investigation of
 7
      Mr. Ahmed is ongoing. Imagine the prosecution for Mr. Ahmed
      for that forgery offense in which we use computer evidence but
 8
      then tell his attorney that we have destroyed the image so
 9
10
      that he cannot have his own expert search through that image
11
      and make determinations of whose computer, who was the user,
12
      and so forth.
13
               THE COURT: But the government is telling me today
14
      that the evidence that they are going to use at trial is not
15
      from the 2015 search of the image they had had since 2012 but
16
      from the consent search from Mr. Martinez.
17
               MR. KOEHLER: That is correct.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. And the thumb drive is the subject
      also of the 2015 search warrant?
19
               MR. KOEHLER: That is correct.
20
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
2.2
               MR. KOEHLER:
                             Thank you.
23
               THE COURT: It's ordered taking this matter under
24
      advisement.
25
               I wanted to discuss a couple of other things with
```

1 vou. I know that there has been a superseding indictment. 2 MR. KOEHLER: Your Honor, my co-counsel reminded me 3 that there is one possible use of the 2012 computer and that 4 would be for impeachment purposes. 5 In other words, if Mr. Kareem were to take the 6 witness stand and testify in some manner that contradicted 7 what we found in the 2012 warrant, we would reserve the right 8 to be able to use it for impeachment. 9 I apologize for the interruption. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 11 There is a second superseding indictment that was 12 returned last week. And I'm sure that Mr. Maynard is aware of 13 it, even though Mr. Kareem has not yet been arraigned on that. 14 I understand he is going to be arraigned on that superceding 15 indictment tomorrow morning before a magistrate judge. 16 And what I wanted to get some preliminary information 17 about from you in particular, Mr. Maynard, is whether the 18 addition of Count 5 is something that you anticipated and already have the discovery on, or whether the addition of 19 20 Count 5 will likely affect your trial preparation and the time 21 that's needed. 22 We presently have a trial date of February 16th. It may be premature to discuss that. We will have 23 24 another opportunity to meet, which is the second subject as to

when that was, because it seems like next Monday as 1:30

25

```
1
      doesn't make any sense at this point.
 2
               So do you know yet, Mr. Maynard?
 3
               MR. MAYNARD: Do I know what?
 4
               THE COURT: Whether or not the addition of Count 5 in
 5
      the second -- I didn't compare them side-by-side, but I assume
 6
      Counts 1 through 4 have not changed and only Count 5 has been
 7
      added.
               MR. KOEHLER: There are changes to Counts 1 and 4 --
 8
      or not 1 and 4; to Counts 1 and 3.
 9
10
               Count 1 had an additional "overt agent" added at the
      end and Count 3 --
11
12
               THE COURT: So that would be the fourth "overt act"
13
      would be new?
14
               MR. KOEHLER: Correct. And then Count 3 added the
15
      terrorism enhancement allegation for the false statements in
16
      violation of the 1001.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. And then Count 5 is entirely new?
               MR. KOEHLER: That is correct.
18
19
               MR. MAYNARD: If I understand the Court's question,
      did I anticipate that the government would file a separate
20
      superseding indictment?
21
22
               No. Because the evidence didn't change. I mean --
23
               THE COURT: But I guess it's more importantly, will
24
      this change our trial date?
25
               MR. MAYNARD: No.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. Good. The second thing that I wanted to just note for the 2 3 record is that when we last met, we spoke about the 4 possibility of a written questionnaire. And I believe the 5 deadline to submit any proposed questionnaire was yesterday 6 and none was submit. 7 MR. KOEHLER: That's for mailing, Your Honor. We anticipated we have been working on a 8 questionnaire for -- to give to them the morning of or the day 9 10 before. As I recall when we met last, you advised us that any 11 12 questionnaire that we wanted sent out via mail in advance of 13 the trial would need to be submitted by yesterday. However, 14 the deadline was later, noon on February 1 of 2016, if they were going to be filled out at the courthouse. 15 16 THE COURT: Okay. So that's the distinction? 17 Because we did have that discussion about the pros and cons of 18 each method. And so the parties have rejected the idea of sending 19 a questionnaire by mail to an enormous number of prospective 20 jurors to complete without supervision. 21 2.2 MR. MAYNARD: Judge, we have been working on a 23 questionnaire also. But I think it's possible with it, 24 although I do not want to put the trial date off at all and I

don't think it's necessary, with the additional counts and the

25

```
1
      allegations of additional "overt acts," it may extend the
 2
      trial a little longer, I think.
 3
               I don't know if we want to send out a questionnaire
 4
      to the jury strictly just on the time.
 5
               THE COURT: Oh. We already agreed to that.
 6
      can discuss -- it may be premature -- they send that out --
 7
      it's like four weeks in advance --
               THE CLERK:
                          45 days.
 8
               THE COURT: 45 days, so six weeks and three days in
 9
10
      advance.
11
               We had previously agreed that prospective jurors
12
      would be prescreened for length of trial and that the dates
13
      were February 16th through March 11th which is a period of
14
      four weeks of four-day-a-week trial.
15
               We obviously have a little bit of time. Not a lot.
      Six weeks before February 16th is probably next -- it's
16
17
     probably Monday.
               So if there's going to be any change or anticipated
18
      change that would extend the trial beyond March 11th, we need
19
      to know that before we send out the prescreening questionnaire
20
      which tells the jurors nothing but what the length of the
21
22
      trial is.
23
               So do you anticipate any additional trial time as a
24
      result of the additions in the second superseding indictment?
25
               MR. KOEHLER: We do not.
```

```
1
               MR. MAYNARD: I don't know if the government is
 2
      anticipating providing me with some new evidence to support
 3
      these claims or not. If they are --
 4
               THE COURT:
                           Is there any new disclosure, Mr. Koehler?
 5
               MR. KOEHLER: We are still finalizing the product on
 6
      the cellular analysis that we have discussed with Mr. Maynard.
               We turned over the Cellebrite data to them in
 7
 8
      spreadsheet form so that they could have their own analysis
      performed of it.
 9
10
               There are a few reports that are left to produce, one
11
      of which is the report of the 2015 search. They have the
12
      image but they don't have the report of the search of that.
13
               And there may be a few other stray things out there.
14
      Mr. Maynard requested a couple of interviews of related
15
      subjects of the investigation.
16
               And we are -- we have those in hand as of this
17
      morning. Those will be turned over in disclosure this
      afternoon. We are working on getting the records of those
18
      interviews turned over as soon as possible as well.
19
20
               We're in the final stages. There's a few things here
      and there that need to be cleaned up and make sure that we
21
22
      have all our T's crossed and I's dotted, but we're about
23
      there.
24
               MR. MAYNARD: Well, assuming there isn't anything
25
      extraordinarily new. I mean, I'm still hearing now that there
```

1 is an investigative report and there's 302s on my client that 2 occurred back in 2011 that I haven't seen. But I will deal 3 with those issues with the government probably this afternoon. 4 But it's been a little slow in getting the materials 5 that we need. But I don't anticipate that we're going to come 6 to this court and ask for any extensions. I'm not sure that I wouldn't add an extra week onto 7 the length of the trial because of this allegation, the new 8 allegation in Count 5. 9 10 THE COURT: That's kind of what I was thinking. Maybe to be on the safe side, we should take it to 11 12 March 18th and that would be five weeks. And I think 13 everybody would agree that we shouldn't have any difficulty 14 with a five-week -- as long as we're prescreening a jury, 15 there's no reason to be stingy about the length. 16 MR. MAYNARD: I think that's a good suggestion, 17 Judge. THE COURT: Okay. So we will have the clerk's office 18 prescreen from February 16th to March 18th. 19 20 I mentioned a moment ago that we had a Final Pretrial Conference set for January 4th at 1:30. We set that, of 21 22 course, when we had the January trial date, but we did not 23 vacate it with the idea that we might still need to have some 24 further discussion. But I don't know if there is anything

more to discuss on Monday than there would be today.

25

```
1
               Mr. Koehler?
 2
               MR. KOEHLER: I don't either, Your Honor.
 3
               MR. MAYNARD: I don't anticipate there would be,
 4
      Judge.
 5
               THE COURT: So we'll vacate January 4th.
 6
               MS. BROOK: January 4th.
 7
               THE COURT: How about if we set a Final Pretrial
 8
      Conference on Monday, February 8th at 10:00 and that will
      be -- I will have had your proposed questionnaires. Do we
 9
10
      need to reset deadlines for -- oh, no. Oh, no. We have them.
11
      We already did.
12
               I'm going to make a revision though. I had set joint
13
      statement of the case, joint proposed voir dire and
14
      supplementary voir dire to which there is no objections by
15
      noon, February 1. We will keep that in place.
16
               Trial briefs, joint proposed jury instructions,
17
      supplemental are due February 9th.
18
               And just thinking out loud, I don't really know that
      we need to have those by the Final Pretrial Conference. So I
19
20
      think we will just keep that date, unless you think there
21
      would be some reason that that would be a discussion at the
22
      Final Pretrial Conference.
23
               MR. KOEHLER: I think we're fine with that, Your
24
      Honor.
25
               MR. MAYNARD: I think we are fine.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: So the written questionnaire that is
 2
      being considered is due noon, February 1, and we're going to
 3
      keep the number of prescreened jurors at 150.
 4
               MR. KOEHLER: Could you repeat that, Your Honor?
 5
               THE COURT: 150 prescreened. So jurors who -- not
 6
      all of them, but haven't given us a good excuse for why they
      can't serve for five weeks.
 7
               MR. KOEHLER: We are in agreement with that, Your
 8
      Honor.
 9
10
               MR. MAYNARD: That's fine.
11
               MR. KOEHLER: Your Honor, there is one matter we
12
      wanted to raise; and that is, the January 4 date for
      preliminary witness and exhibit lists.
13
14
               I would like to request that we push that back to
15
      Friday, January 8th.
               THE COURT: Any objection?
16
               MR. MAYNARD: No.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. Friday the 8th.
18
               Everything else that we have set out in the order
19
      from November 24th then is the same other than that -- that's
20
      the only date we changed and the prescreened date for length
21
2.2
      of trial.
23
               Okay. Unless something new happens, I will see you
24
      on February 8th.
25
               Oh, and, Mr. Maynard, I wanted to let you know that I
```

```
1
      took care of your pending CJA matters with the exception of
      one yesterday and the one that remains should be taken care of
 2
 3
      today.
 4
               MR. MAYNARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Court is in recess.
 5
 6
          (Proceedings adjourned at 10:48 a.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	I, ELIZABETH A. LEMKE, do hereby certify that I am
5	duly appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter
6	for the United States District Court for the District of
7	Arizona.
8	I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute
9	a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion
10	of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled
11	cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript
12	was prepared under my direction and control.
13	DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 17th day of April,
14	2016.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	<u>s/Elizabeth A. Lemke</u> ELIZABETH A. LEMKE, RDR, CRR, CPE
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	